

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities. Applicants have amended the specification as shown and believe it is now in good form.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include reference signs mentioned in the specification. Applicants have amended the drawings as shown and believe they are now in good form.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15 and 21 for various informalities. Applicants have cancelled claims 9, 14, 15 and 21 and have amended the other claims as shown and believe they are now in good form.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims as shown and believe they are now in good form.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 18, 91, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neveus (U.S. Patent 4,210,833). The Examiner stated various reasons for the rejection. The Examiner also rejected claims 1 to 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Caplan et al. (U.S. 2004/0223845). The Examiner stated reasons for the rejection. Applicants have cancelled claims 9 - 17, 21, and 23 - 37. Applicants have also amended the remaining independent claims as shown. In view of the claims as now presented and for the reasons discussed below, Applicants believe that the remaining claims are not anticipated by either Neveus or Caplan et al.

Neveus discloses a motor-fan unit, particularly for the cooling of the circulation water of an automobile vehicle motor, comprising a helicoid fan driven by an electric

motor. A centrifugal interior blading draws air through the electric motor to cool it. The motor is fixed in a housing having at least one lateral opening for air entry which is located radially opposite a cavity formed in an arm connecting the housing to a collar which surrounds the helicoid fan. The cavity has a generally U-shaped section with its concavity turned downstream of the flow of air drawn in by the helicoid fan.

Caplan et al. discloses an automotive engine-cooling fan assembly including a motor having a driveshaft defining a central axis, and a fan driven by the motor. The fan includes an inner hub portion coupled to the driveshaft, and an outer hub portion coupled to the inner hub portion. The outer hub portion is coupled to a plurality of radially-extending blades. The fan also includes a plurality of vibration isolation members interconnecting the inner hub portion and the outer hub portion.

In contrast, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 18 to further focus on features of the embodiments being claimed. As now recited, Applicants have recited that the hub comprises a generally planar portion that is situated in opposed relation to a front face of the housing of the motor and has a cylindrical portion that is situated in opposed relationship to at least a portion of the cylindrical housing. The distances between the front face of the motor housing and the hub being smaller than the distance between the circular portion of the hub and the generally cylindrical housing of the electric motor. Applicants have also amended the claim to further recite that the flange is downside of the generally cylindrical portion of the hub.

None of the references, when viewed alone or in combination, teach of the limitations now recited in Applicants' amended claims. For example, the part in Neveux that the Examiner believes is a flange, is not situated downstream of the cylindrical portion of the hub as now recited in Applicants' claims. Also, note that in the Caplan et al. reference, the distance between the front of the hub and the front of the motor appears to be the same as a distance between the hub and the side wall of the motor. Applicants have found that the differences in sizes of the areas between the hub and

the front wall of the motor housing and the hub and the side wall of the motor housing area as now recited in Applicants' claims facilitates enabling airflow through the motor.

Finally, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's interpretation of Caplan et al. as containing a flange. Indeed, that part, which is unlabeled and unidentified, appears to be part of a fan shroud for holding the motor. It appears to have a thin wall (as viewed in the figure) that extends to what may be a surrounding shroud. In any event, the reference is unclear and a skilled artisan viewing the reference alone would not view the rectangular box as a flange, but rather, a support. Notwithstanding, Applicants have amended the remaining claims in order to advance prosecution and to further distinguish over the references.

For all the foregoing reasons and in view of the claims as now presented, Applicants respectfully submits that these claims are not anticipated by the cited references and should be allowed.

FOR ALL THE FOREGOING REASONS, APPLICANTS BELIEVE THIS CASE IS NOW IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. IF THE EXAMINER FEELS THAT THIS AMENDMENT DOES NOT PLACE THE CASE IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE, THEN APPLICANTS RESPECTFULLY REQUEST AN INTERVIEW WITH THE EXAMINER.

Applicants are filing concurrently herewith a request for a one-month extension of time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1287. Applicants hereby provide a general request for any extension of time which may be required at any time during the prosecution of the application. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any fees which have not been previously paid for by check and which are required during the

Serial No. 10/675,342
Response to Office Action of November 27, 2006
Examiner: Michael Koczo, Jr.
Docket: VAL 181 P2

prosecution of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-1287. (Should Deposit Account No. 50-1287 be deficient, please charge any further deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 10-0220.)

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned via telephone with any questions or comments regarding this case.

Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Matthew R. Jenkins", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

By

Matthew R. Jenkins
Reg. No. 34,844

2310 Far Hills Building
Dayton, OH 45419-1575
(937) 298-2811

March 27, 2007
MRJ/rl